

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		AT	TORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/817,076	07/15/97	YAMAMOTO		К Ø:	5905.0027
Г		LM61/0114	٦ . [EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN HENDERSON FARABOW GARRETT & DUNNER			,	NGUYEN, T	
1300 I STREE	ET NW			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON I	C 2 0005- 33:	15	_	2779	12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

DATE MAILED: 01/14/00

Advisory Action

Application No. 08/817,076

Applicant(s)

Yamamoto

Examiner

Thu Nguyen

Group Art Unit 2772



TH	E PER	IOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]			
	a) 🗌	expires months from the mailing date of the final rejection.			
	b) [Х]	expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.			
	determ	tension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of ining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be ted from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.			
	period	lant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on (or within any for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).			
Ap but	plicant is NC	s's response to the final rejection, filed on <u>Dec 28, 1999</u> has been considered with the following effect, T deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:			
		oposed amendment(s):			
					
	w 	they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).			
		they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).			
		they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.			
		they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.			
	NO	· •			
	□ Ar	pplicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):			
	Newly separa	proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a ate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.			
X	for all Applic	ifidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition owance because: cant's argument is not persuasive. Independent claims does not highlight the make and use of the overlapping			
		s. Claims 3, 5, 14, 16 highlight the make and use of overlapping means and have been objected by examiners. If idavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by			
	the Ex	aminer in the final rejection.			
		rposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):			
		s allowed:s objected to: <i>3, 5, 14, and 16</i>			
		rejected to: 3, 5, 14, and 16 rejected: 2, 4, 6-13, 15, 17, and 18			
		oposed drawing correction filed on hashas not been approved by the Examiner.			
	Note t	he attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s).			
	Other	MahRo			
		MARK R. POWELL SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER GROUP 2700			